REMARKS

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on U.S. Patent Number 5,822,790 issued to Mehrotra ("Mehrotra") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,303,149 issued to Janigian ("Janigian"). Applicants submitted an IDS on November 25, 2003. Applicants respectfully request an initialed copy of this IDS.

Claim 1 recites "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client." The examiner correctly states that Mehrotra does not disclose "determining the existence of data redundancies in said prefetch data," as recited in claim 1. The examiner also correctly states that Mehrotra does not disclose "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1.

The examiner then states that "Janigian teaches the method of sending a reduced set of data from the server to the client...details how a series of tests are run over a set of data to eliminate duplicates, thus reducing the size of the data set. The Janigian method utilizes a computerized electronic banking network, thereby sending the data from the server to a client."

Claim 1 recites "determining the existence of data redundancies **in said prefetch data**," and "**transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client.**" (emphasis added). The method of "eliminating duplicates, thus reducing the size of the data set" disclosed by Janigian is in fact a method of eliminating duplicate entries from a mailing list. The method of Janigian performs a series of tests that are designed to identify two mailing list records as duplicates even if certain mailing address elements of the match codes in the two mailing list records do not match exactly (e.g., where the name, address or last two positions of the zip code in either record has been miskeyed).

Applicants submit that the method of identifying duplicate mailing addresses in a mailing list cannot be used in "determining the existence of data redundancies in said prefetch data," as recited in claim 1. For example, the method of Janigian identifies two address entries for the same Post Office address, by comparing human names, street names, street numbers, and zip codes. Two address entries in Janigian can be "duplicate" even if one or more of the entries in the two residential address records do not match.

Attempting to apply this method of comparing names and residential addresses of people described by Janigian to perform "determining the existence of data redundancies in said prefetch data," as recited in claim 1, results in failure. Therefore, Janigian does not disclose "determining the existence of data redundancies in said prefetch data," as recited in claim 1. As a result, Janigian cannot disclose "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1.

The cited references are now discussed in detail to show that the prior art neither discloses nor suggests the claimed elements of "determining the existence of data redundancies in said prefetch data," and "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client."

Mehrotra discloses:

> When the processor accesses a memory address, the cache memory determines if the data associated with the memory address is stored in the cache memory. If the data is stored in the cache memory, a cache hit results and the data is provided to the processor from the cache memory. If the data is not in the cache memory, a cache miss results and a lower level in the memory hierarchy must be accessed. A cache memory that maintains a cached set of memory locations approximating the set of most recently accessed memory locations is a historical cache memory.

(Column 1, lines 22-32). Mehrotra also discloses:

> The effectiveness of prefetching is limited to the ability of a particular prefetching method to predict addresses from which the processor will need to access data. Successful prefetching methods typically seek to take advantage of patterns in memory accesses by observing all, or a particular subset of, memory transactions and prefetching as yet unaccessed data for anticipated memory accesses. Memory transactions observed can include read and/or write accesses or cache miss transactions.

(Column 1, lines 46-55). Mehrotra does not disclose "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Janigian discloses:

> The present invention overcomes the disadvantages of the prior art by providing a method and apparatus whereby repeat solicitations are unnecessary and inadvertent duplicate solicitations are greatly reduced. For the purposes of discussion and easy understanding, the invention will be described in terms of one application of the present invention wherein the purpose of a solicitation is to obtain a contribution for a political campaign.

(Column 1, line 61 through Column 2, line 1). This section of Janigian does not disclose "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1 as amended. Janigian also discloses:

> In order to avoid sending duplicate solicitation letters and duplicate drafts, the method of the present invention utilizes a novel computer program for creating and managing contributor lists. The program of the present invention performs a series of tests that are designed to identify two records as duplicates even if certain elements of the match codes in the two records do not match exactly (e.g., where the name, address or last two positions of the zip code in either record has been miskeyed).

(Column 2, lines 37-46). This section of Janigian does not disclose "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1 as amended. Janigian also discloses:

1. Quadrants (NW vs., N.W. vs., Northwest)

2. Zip 20016 vs. 20061
3. North Fifth Street vs. N 5th Street
4. Two Dupont Circle vs. 2 Dupont Circle
5. 12-34 Park Road vs. 1234 Park Road
6. O Neil vs. O'Neil
7. Mac Donald vs. MacDonald
8. Luca vs. de Luca
9. Phiffer vs. Fiffer
10. Goldschmidt vs. Goldsmith
11. Smith-Jones vs. Jones
12. 123 Park Road vs. 128 Park Rd
13. Route 2, Box 33 vs. RR2 PO Box 38

(Column 6, lines 22-34). This section of Janigian does not disclose "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1 as amended. Janigian also discloses:

> STREET NAMES differ
> but:
> positions 4 and 5 of STREET NUMBERS match
> and the first 6 positions of LAST NAMES match
> and the last 2 positions of ZIP CODES match.
> Example:
> PREV REC: MARY JOHNSON 1234 PARK 20016
> -continued
> CURR REC: MARY JOHNSON 1234 PRAK 20016

(Column 7, line 63 through Column 8, line 3). This section of Janigian does not disclose "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1 as amended. Janigian also discloses:

> The example above illustrates that even though the street numbers differ and the last name may be misspelled in one record, a duplicate record will still be discovered.
>
> All further tests in the program require that the street names and numbers match for a duplicate record to be discovered.

(Column 8, lines 59-65). This section of Janigian does not disclose "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1 as amended. Janigian also discloses:

A method of creating lists comprising the steps of:

creating a file, said file comprising a plurality of records, each record including a name and address of an individual,

selecting portions of each record,

making a first comparison between a first predetermined portion of a first record and a first predetermined portion of at least one second record to determine if said first portions match,

if said first portions do not match, making a subsequent comparison between a second predetermined portion of said first record and a second predetermined portion of said at least one second record to determine if said second portions match,

if said first portions do match, making a subsequent comparison between a third predetermined portion of said first record and a third predetermined portion of said at least one second record to determine if said third portions match,

identifying at least one duplicate record in said file when a predetermined combination of said first, second, and third portions match,

eliminating identified duplicate records from said file and creating a second file of unique records, wherein no two unique records identify the same individual,

creating a list of individuals from said second file of 45 unique records

(Column 13, lines 19-46). This section of Janigian does not disclose "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Even if Mehrotra and Janigian were combined, the combination would neither teach nor suggest "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Therefore, applicants submit that claim 1 as amended is patentable over Mehrotra in view of Janigian. Given that claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 as amended, applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Mehrotra in view of Janigian.

Mehrotra and Janigian, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest "transmitting a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 11 as amended. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 11 as amended is patentable over Mehrotra in view of Janigian. Given that claims 12-22 depend from claim 11 as amended, applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Mehrotra in view of Janigian.

Mehrotra and Janigian, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest "transmit a reduced set of prefetch data from the server to the client," as recited in claim 23 as amended. Therefore, applicants submit that claim 23 as amended is patentable over Mehrotra in view of Janigian.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If the Commissioner determines that additional fees are due or that an excess fee has been paid, the Patent Office is authorized to debit or credit (respectively) Deposit Account No. 50-2518, billing reference no. 7011022001.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: July 7, 2004

By: _____
Jeffrey Smith
Reg. No. 39,377

Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4422
Telefax: (650) 849-4800